

From: Bstnwaler21@aol.com [mailto:Bstnwaler21@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 9:21 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Dear Madam/Sir

I'm writing this in support of Proposal 2-XA of the latest MLPA proposed legislation. Being a fisherman for over 50 years, a Certified Diver (PADI/NAUI /USN (EOD) for over 40 years, a licensed Captain (50 tons) for over five years, a born and raised Californian (59 years)...and most important of all a father and a grandfather of fishermen and fisherwomen. Proposal 2-XA would allow me to keep taking my 7 year old grandson to SAFE areas to fish and still be able to enjoy an open ocean environment. Many of the other Proposals only leave open areas that are accessible only on the nicest days of water conditions and require a longer journey that can be hard on someone of that age. Also Proposal 2-XA puts an emphasis on TOTAL ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION with very strong leaning towards the HIGH level of protection. Many of the other Proposals would not only make my own fishing trips more dangerous than open water fishing needs to be but would also put heavy fishing pressure on small areas that are left open and do much more harm to the resource we all want to protect and save for future generations. I was at the meeting in Bodega last year when the Central Coast MLPA was voted in and one quote from a speaker has stuck in my memory.. "we want to save the Ocean for our grandchildren"...and I would like to please have your help in letting my grandson KEEP enjoying and learning about HIS Ocean...thank you and please support Proposal 2-XA for all the future generations...

Captain Mark Capra

From: Alan Kabert [mailto:alan@valuebp.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 1:47 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: ocean fishing

As a life long fisherman I ask your support for supporting Proposal 2-XA. Of all the plans Proposal 2-XA makes the most sense to protect and allow enjoyment of our ocean.

Alan Kabert

From: Allen Leepin [mailto:allenleepin@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 8:17 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Total Support Of Proposal 2XA North Central Coast

March 27, 2008

**To: Members of the Blue Ribbon Task Force and
The California Fish and Game Commission**

**Subject: Adoption of Proposal 2XA for the North Central Coast Phase of the
M.L.P.A.**

Dear Members;

As a lifelong resident of Northern California I am writing in support of Proposal 2XA which meets and exceeds the intention of the MLPA.

Our family was introduced to the outdoors and fishing at a young age through our father. Fishing has led us to a fond appreciation and respect of the ocean whether it be tide pooling, diving, or most importantly, kayaking. Proposal 2XA allows us continued use of Salt Point State Park , providing a safe legal access to a very sustainable shoreline.

State parks are ideal for ocean public access due to their existing park rangers, lifeguards, camping and restrooms. Any of the other proposals other than Proposal 2XA would promote the use of less developed areas of our shoreline, increasing the possibility of trespass, environmental concerns, and a safety issues.

Proposal 2XA was drafted to provide the most common sense approach to the MLPA.

Respectfully,

Allen L. Leepin

From: Allen Leepin [mailto:allenleepin@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 7:58 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Attach is a letter for my total support o Proposal 2XA for MLPA the North Central Coast

March 27, 2008

**To: Members of the Blue Ribbon Task Force and
The California Fish and Game Commission**

Subject: Adoption of Proposal 2XA for the North Central Coast Phase of the M.L.P.A.

Dear Members;

As a lifelong resident of Northern California I am writing in support of Proposal 2XA which meets and exceeds the intention of the MLPA.

Our family was introduced to the outdoors and fishing at a young age through our father. Fishing has led us to a fond appreciation and respect of the ocean whether it be tide pooling, diving, or most importantly, kayaking. Proposal 2XA allows us continued use of Salt Point State Park , providing a safe legal access to a very sustainable shoreline.

State parks are ideal for ocean public access due to their existing park rangers,

lifeguards, camping and restrooms. Any of the other proposals other than Proposal 2XA would promote the use of less developed areas of our shoreline, increasing the possibility of trespass, environmental concerns, and a safety issues.

Proposal 2XA was drafted to provide the most common sense approach to the MLPA.

Respectfully,

Allen L. Leepin

From: Andrew Merriam [mailto:ajmerriam@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 12:54 PM
To: MLPAComments; Mike Chrisman
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov
Subject: Letter in support of Proposal 2-XA

To the California DFG and Mr Schwarzenegger,

Please implement Proposal 2-XA for Northern California MLPA act.

As a long-time fisherman, spear-fisherman, and abalone diver, I have had the pleasure and privilege to enjoy the bounty of the California coast. Over the years, I have seen first-hand the changes to different fish and ab populations and have every motivation to ensure that these kinds of fishing activities will be enjoyed for future generations.

Protection of the natural resource is indeed essential for sustainability.

In pondering how best to protect different species and coastal areas, I would ask that you consider the source and magnitude of the various threats posed by humanity, and to focus your efforts on the dominant threats. In particular, it is my belief that the impact of recreational fishermen such as myself are vanishingly small when compared with the impacts of poaching, habitat destruction, river damming, unrestrained development and wetlands removal, polluted runoff water, and commercial harvests. Therefore, a whole-sale elimination of recreational fishing will not perceptibly alter man's impact on the Pacific Ocean, but it will strongly affect many thousands of individuals for whom a trip to the water for dinner is a sublime and irreplaceable experience.

My feeling is that We on a state and national level should devote our attention to the big threats just mentioned, because it is a sine qua non situation: if we don't fix the big problems, then merely dealing with the window-dressing will not save the fish. Just because the bigger problems are more difficult to tackle does not absolve us of the responsibility to do so.

Sincereley,

Andrew

Andrew Merriam

-----Original Message-----

From: Artie Garcia [<mailto:Artie.Garcia@ssa.sccgov.org>]

Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 4:50 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: MLPA Proposal Support for Option 2-XA

Members of MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force,

My name is Arturo Garcia and I am writing this letter on behalf of myself and my entire family to express our support of Proposal 2-XA. I find it impossible to associate myself with one particular stakeholder group as I participate in many activities: breathhold diving, swimming, surfing, underwater photography, tide pooling, kayaking, camping and fishing. Participation in these activities as both a consumptive and non-consumptive user places me in an awkward situation as I wish very much to conserve the marine environment and the eco systems it supports while simultaneously allowing public access to continue on with positive marine interaction.

My aquatic experiences began at an early age and the beneficial family oriented aspects of being on the coast are something I very much wish to continue sharing with my own children. As a child my family spent many weekends camping along the San Mateo coast where overnight access is now prohibited and State Park space is limited and hard to come by. I spent many days on the water fishing as well but as you know previous methods of Fishery Management left much to be desired and we are now addressing regulations to increase Fish Populations. Again I find myself in a situation increasingly more difficult to involve my family in enjoying the coast. I believe that a knee jerk reaction to make as many, "Reserves," as possible is the wrong direction for the MLPA task force to move in. To balance both Preservation and Public Access there is a compromise that can be reached that will enable the marine environment to flourish. Considering proposal 2-XA goes beyond the minimum requirements set forth by the MLPA initiative I do believe this to be the best option as it caters to the needs of both Consumptive and Non-Consumptive users without favoring one group over another.

Having been a participant at MLPA meetings and hearing the many factors needed to be considered before finalizing the North Central MPA's I must say that there is no compromise that better suits ALL stakeholders than proposal 2-XA.

Artie Garcia

From: Bob Aberle [mailto:tbonejack@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 11:28 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Don't take away our right to fish

I am supporting proposal 2-XA. Being a lifelong California fisherman, I have a hard time accepting the reasoning behind some of the causes and answers to our Salmon Number problems. I have seen and experienced some of California's best and worst Salmon fishing. The answer to the problem is simple--- Water is the answer, but a two part answer. #1- Amount of release from upstream dams or lack thereof #2- Diversion of both water and juvenile Salmon .

From: McDonnell, Robert (Bob) (CIV) [mailto:bmcdonnell@nps.edu]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 9:14 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject:

I fully realize the difficulty in striking a balance in most any project. Considering a variety of user groups, mentalities & unproven science makes this task even more daunting. Sportsmen have long been the champions of preservation of resources while actually partaking in those resources recreationally, spiritually and consumptively. This should not be about protection for the sake of protection, but protection of the common heritage of California which we share, sometimes differently than others.

Please accept my support for Option 2XA. It is apparent that this option is the best thought out, the most inclusive of all user groups and the best at striking that delicate balance between ecology and access. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on sportsmen, coastal communities and marine related business.

We have a long way to go to counter some of man's negative influences on his environment. Let's not eliminate sportsmen from being effective messengers and "realtime" stewards and observers of the habitat and its inhabitants. In my opinion, over-restricting access is the worst thing that could happen in the long fight ahead. Losing the next generation's involved interest is at risk.

Sincerely,

Bob McDonnell

-----Original Message-----

From: Bruce MacKimmie [mailto:bmackimmie@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 7:25 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support of 2-XA

Attention Rights takers, I I write this letter in support of 2-XA.

This is the best of the worst. I guess I should be thank-full that you are not taking all my fishing rights away just most of them. I have lived owned property and voted here in Northern California for over 25 years. That whole time I have fished and dove in these waters, as has my son who is 19 years of age. He loves fishing also. The first time we had him out on a boat he was six months old and he became addicted right away. Please pass 2-XA so that we can still fish together.

Thanks,
Bruce MacKimmie,
Tax payer and voter and Fishing license buyer.

From: Carl Moyer [mailto:carlmarc@astound.net]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 8:16 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Option

I support option 2-XA because:

Please accept my support for Option 2XA. It is apparent that this option is the best thought out, the most inclusive of all user groups and the best at striking that delicate balance between ecology and access. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on sportsmen, coastal communities and marine related business.

Carl Moyer

From: Carl Moyer [mailto:carlmarc@astound.net]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 8:06 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposals

I think 2-XA is the best proposal for everyone. We set aside some areas to safeguard our fish and satisfy that need, and we leave open other areas to allow to allow people such as myself and my family to enjoy the fishing and satisfy that need. Thank you for your consideration.

Carl Moyer

From: CwWildwood@aol.com [mailto:CwWildwood@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 3:50 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: I support option 2-XA

As an avid fisherman and conservationist, I support option 2-XA. This is a well thought out option that protects the ecosystem and still allows me to take my grandkids fishing once in awhile.
Craig D. Wood

Half Moon Bay

From: DALEMYER@aol.com [mailto:DALEMYER@aol.com]

Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 1:50 PM

To: MLPAComments; Mike Chrisman

Subject: Support 2-XA

March 28, 2008

MLPA Comments

Secretary Chrisman

To whom it may concern,

I am a California native living in the Bay Area all my life. Since the first time my Dad took me fishing at age 4, I have enjoyed recreational fishing. This started at the Tilden Park trout pond, the Berkeley Pier and finally, fast forward 48 years, as a private boat owner.

Let me clearly state **I do not like any restrictions on my right to fish.** After reviewing all the surviving proposals on the table, I would like urge the members of the BRTF and the Fish & Game Commission to **support Proposal 2-XA.**

From the webcasts and website info I glean that Proposal 1/3 needs more detail work yet still is unnecessarily restrictive covering 22% of the North Central region. Proposal 4 is simply overkill touching 27% of said region.

Proposal 2-XA is the most detailed, well thought through plan including small boat safety. Using the best science available, 2-XA meets or exceeds the goals of the MLPA and does so affecting the least amount of the region coming in at 18%. 2-XA will be painful to all consumptive users but it's the least amount of pain while achieving the MLPA goals.

This is a no brainer. Should a more restrictive plan be selected, you will never convince fishermen and women that there wasn't a pre-determined agenda nor will what little faith in the system that exists, remain.

Eighteen percent is bad enough but doable. The more restrictive plans will certainly destroy the already fragile fishing community's multi-million dollar economy putting people's recreation and in many cases, livelihoods in jeopardy.

Dale A. Myer
Clayton

From: Dean Taylor [mailto:deanos@earthlink.net]

Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 5:19 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Science of MPA

To All in the Decision Making Process:

I agree with the goals that Californians had in mind when they passed this law in 1999. The most important to me are protecting the ecosystem and supporting weak fish stocks. I support MPA's where reasonable, and supported by science. I am a firm believer in conservation, maintaining healthy fish population levels, and not overfishing. I also believe that eating seafood, especially wild, sustainable seafood, is very beneficial for society as a whole, and that this should be a viable choice for all Californians. For this reason, I would like you to support Proposal 2-XA. I believe it to be the most reasonable, achieving the goals of the MLPA, meets DF&G guidelines, puts restrictions where they will help the most - and is supported by sound scientific models, has been peer reviewed by those who most understand the marine ecosystem, and yet still allows for reasonable fishing opportunities - a goal that is not mutually exclusive with the goals of the MLPA. Proposal 2-XA also has the greatest benefits for society as a whole, including those who enjoy seeing nature thrive, and the boating, fishing, seafood, restaurant and tourism industries in California. Proposal 2-XA will serve to protect and allow sustainable use also.

Please vote for 2-XA.

Born & Raised in S.F., now have 5 grandchildren

Dean Taylor

From: Hayden, Edward [mailto:Edward.Hayden@netapp.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 1:06 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA options

I am a native Californian and recreational angler. I implore you to consider Option 2-XA as the only choice that would offer some opportunity to the recreational fisherman while simultaneously protecting areas of our coast. Any other option but 2-XA will have a tremendous negative financial impact on coastal communities, harbors, charter boat operations, boat and tackle sales, taxes derived from fuel sales, and the myriad of other businesses related to the fishing industry. Option 2-XA is the only fair choice available for establishing zones of protection while still allowing the ocean to be shared and enjoyed by all".

Ed Hayden
Saratoga, CA

From: Hayden, Edward [mailto:Edward.Hayden@netapp.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 1:05 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA options - important!

I am a native Californian and recreational angler. I implore you to consider Option 2-XA as the only choice that would offer some opportunity to the recreational fisherman while simultaneously protecting areas of our coast. Any other option but 2-XA will have a tremendous negative financial impact on coastal communities, harbors, charter boat operations, boat and tackle sales, taxes derived from fuel sales, and the myriad of other businesses related to the fishing industry. Option 2-XA is the only fair choice available for establishing zones of protection while still allowing the ocean to be shared and enjoyed by all.

Edward Hayden
Saratoga, CA

-----Original Message-----

From: ed olson [<mailto:chipsandfish@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 11:39 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject:

Dear BRTF, Thank you for all the time and effort in this process....My wife and I are avid Kyakers and Free Divers we have been following this process for some time and now it comes down to selection...we support 2XA as the most balanced approach and hope you see it the same why....There is no need to take so much as in Proposition 4...2XA is a much better balanced approach to the coast...In proposition 4 there will be no access for Kayakers from Duxbury to well past Double Pt...we need to leave some good fishing areas open with safe access.....Its not many days we can Kayak out to the Farallones but I see that most of that is being closed also....2XA gives us some fishing areas around the Duxbury and up to Double Pt...Thank you for your time and hope you keep a little of our coast open for us small boaters.....

Edwin Olson
Gabrielle Kelly

From: Frank Ledesma [<mailto:ledesma6670@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 5:48 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: In support of 2-XA

To whom it may concern,

Hello I am a member of Coastside fishing club and proud of it. Not only have I learned so much about fishing but I have also learned alot about the conservation of our ocean and our fishery. I belive that proposal 2-XA has has what it takes to support many of the conservation community. We Coastiders are not just fishermen and woman, we are conservationists. We all love and respect the ocean and will do what it takes to preserve it for all of our future.

Thank you, Frank Ledesma

From: Frank Ledesma [mailto:frank@westvalleywood.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 7:50 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: support 2-XA

Hello, I support 2-XA. With the economy the way it is and the price of gas, I cannot afford to go fish the areas that we will be allowed to fish. Please don't take this away from me and my family.

Frank Ledesma
Gilroy Ca.

-----Original Message-----

From: ed olson [mailto:chipsandfish@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 11:39 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject:

Dear BRTF, Thank you for all the time and effort in this process....My wife and I are avid Kyakers and Free Divers we have been following this process for some time and now it comes down to selection...we support 2XA as the most balanced approach and hope you see it the same why....There is no need to take so much as in Proposition 4...2XA is a much better balanced approach to the coast...In proposition 4 there will be no access for Kayakers from Duxbury to well past Double Pt...we need to leave some good fishing areas open with safe access.....Its not many days we can Kayak out to the Farallones but I see that most of that is being closed also....2XA gives us some fishing areas around the Duxbury and up to Double Pt...Thank you for your time and hope you keep a little of our coast open for us small boaters.....

Edwin Olson
Gabrielle Kelly

From: gvmoughan@aol.com [mailto:gvmoughan@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 10:21 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: In Support of 2XA

I want to voice my support for proposal 2XA not just because of my love of fishing but because fishing has brought so much more to my life than the simple act of dropping a line in the water. Fishing gives me my earliest and fondest memories of being with my father, who is now approaching eighty. Fishing has been a bridge in my life and so many other lives on which people of diverse

backgrounds can meet as equals; whether those diverse backgrounds are racial, religious, political or economic, we have met and found common ground. And fishing has opened my eyes to how important it is to protect our coastal waters: we who are fish are not fools who care nothing about the environment around us; rather we are people who have an emotional and personal tie to that environment. If people cannot fish, then those emotional and personal ties are lost, and lost as well will be their support for a healthy ocean.

Gerald Moughan
San Francisco, CA

-----Original Message-----

From: Jack_Gross@amat.com [mailto:Jack_Gross@amat.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 2:44 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: I support MLPA 2-XA

Fishermen are conservationists too. That is why I welcome Proposal 2-XA.

But per the California Constitution, (exerpt below), please don't take away my taxpaying RIGHT to "fish upon and from the public lands of the State".

Sincerely,
Jack Gross - Member, Coastside Fishing Club (p.s. WE are NOT the reason why fish stocks have diminished).

CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE 1 DECLARATION OF RIGHTS

Section 25. The people shall have the right to fish upon and from the public lands of the State and in the waters thereof, excepting upon lands set aside for fish hatcheries, and no land owned by the State shall ever be sold or transferred without reserving in the people the absolute right to fish thereupon; and no law shall ever be passed making it a crime for the people to enter upon the public lands within this State for the purpose of fishing in any water containing fish that have been planted therein by the State; provided, that the legislature may by statute, provide for the season when and the conditions under which the different species of fish may be taken.

From: Jackie Daniels [<mailto:jackiedaniels@comcast.net>]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 7:57 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: CaliforniaResources

Please adopt 2xa into our system for California. I believe it is the fairest of all the proposals, as it gives all fish time to rebound but does not shut out the fisherman.
Thanks,
Ron Daniels

From: Jim Volberding [mailto:jamiv925@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 7:29 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support Proposal 2-XA

Dear ladies and Gentlemen of the BRTF,

I enjoy seeing the humpback and Blue whales off our coast. I've seen a huge leatherback turtle, ocean sunfish.

My Grandsons went out on a charter boat on a calm day which can be a rarity. They were actually able to watch the rockfish bite. They enjoyed watching the dolphins jumping in the boat's wake. I want them to be able to fish and enjoy these same things in the years to come.

Please Accept and Forward Proposal 2-XA to the Fish and Game Commission.

Thank You,
James Volberding

From: Jan Gasperetti [mailto:jgawin@frontiernet.net]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 9:55 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA - Option 2-XA

I am a native Californian and recreational angler. I implore you to consider Option 2-XA as the only choice that would offer some opportunity to the recreational fisherman while simultaneously protecting areas of our coast. Any other option but 2-XA will have a tremendous negative financial impact on coastal communities, harbors, charter boat operations, boat and tackle sales, taxes derived from fuel sales, and the myriad of other businesses related to the fishing industry. Option 2-XA is the only fair choice available for establishing zones of protection while still allowing the ocean to be shared and enjoyed by recreational anglers.

From: Jan Joyce or Jessie Zeiters [mailto:jzfarm@humboldt1.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 9:18 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Public comment

As a Northern California recreational angler I fully support Proposal 2-XA and request that this proposal be supported by the MLPA task force, I feel that this will give the resource protection as required as well as providing reasonable angling access to the anglers of California.

Jan Zeiters
McKinleyville Ca.

From: James Hicks [mailto:havwit@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 10:23 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: I support proposal 2-XA

As a native Californian and a recreation fisherman, I am very concerned about the health of our ocean. I appreciate all you are doing to protect our sea life. The time spent on the water with family and friends is very important to me. My children love fishing and have been taught to care for the ocean and to take only what they will eat. After spending her early years on the ocean, my daughter now plans to be a marine biologist. After reviewing the various proposals regarding the MLPA, it became clear to me that the only proposal which achieves conservation and still allows some recreational fishing in nearby areas off our coast is proposal 2-XA. Proposal 2-XA is based on science, not emotion as the others appear to be, particularly proposal 4. Proposal 2-XA is a strong conservation proposal yet will not have the economic impact on the coastal communities and recreational fishers. Please implement proposal 2-XA, as this proposal is the best of both worlds.

Thank You,
Jim Hicks
Burlingame CA.

From: Joe & Sharon Pearson [mailto:pearson@mcn.org]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 1:28 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: Archer J. Richardson; Robert Filbrun
Subject: Proposed MLP's

Dear Sirs:

I've been watching this MLP process from the sideline for quite a while now. How could something that seems so simple blow up into such a mess? Good lesson though, don't vote for stuff that isn't spelled out in detail first. Anyway I finally found one proposal that seem to balance all the competing interests. That proposal is 2XA. It seems to accomplish all the goals of the environmental people without driving the sport fisherman completely off the water. Proposal 2XA has ample no fishing zone and still allow the sport fisherman access to relatively safe places to fish and dive. It also looks like it is something that is fairly enforceable. I don't know if anyone had talked with any of the actual fish and game agent, the ones actually out patrolling the coast, but they don't have any way of enforcing a lot of these proposals. There is also the issue of safety. Proposal 4 closes almost all the really safe places to dive for Abalone. We lose several divers every year simply because they go where they shouldn't when they shouldn't and every proposal except 2XA will just make things worse. So if you have to pick one of these, please pick Proposal 2XA

Sincerely:

Joe Pearson

From: John Rubins [mailto:steeliejohn@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 12:15 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

After reading the proposals before the committee I urge you to implement proposal 2-XA. This proposal is the most well balanced approach to protecting the fisheries for future generations. I learned to enjoy fishing years ago from my father, I have taught my son's to fish and be good stewards of our environment and resources. I am getting ready to teach my 2 grandsons as well. Please do not take this right away from me to share the serenity and enjoyment on the water with my family while we enjoy fishing.

John Rubins
Vallejo, CA

From: Larry Dini [mailto:diniappraisal@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 9:59 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

To whom it may concern;

I am in complete support of proposal 2-XA. I believe this to be the most well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant socioeconomic impacts to commercial/recreational fisherman and divers.

Sincerely,

Larry Dini
Redwood City, Ca

From: M.Jacob [mailto:finishingedge@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 9:04 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-xa All the way

To whom it may concern,

Any plan other than 2-XA would be a mistake! Please help us make the right decision and get this through.

I'd like to be able to teach my young one to fish someday and I think this will help. Anything else would be wrong.

Regards,

M.jacob

-----Original Message-----

From: Marcus Schroers [<mailto:mschroers1@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 12:41 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: MLPA comment

As a lifelong California native, outdoor enthusiast, fisherman, and father, I support Option #2.

Marcus Schroers

From: Matthew Plut [<mailto:sw44magnum@gmail.com>]

Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 11:35 PM

To: MLPAComments

Cc: Mike Chrisman

Subject: Please Support Proposal 2-XA for the NCC MPA

I am a recreational fisherman, diver and a member of Coastside Fishing Club.

I am writing to urge the members of the BRTF and the Fish and Game Commission to support **Proposal 2-XA** because it not only satisfies, but exceeds the criteria defined for marine reserves by achieving a "High" level of protection while also satisfying the size and spacing requirements. I can honestly say I believe **Proposal 2-XA** is excessive, yet it is the only one of the three which I would consider acceptable. I can live with this proposal. **Proposal 2-XA** has accomplished these goals while impacting about 18% of the coast line. This is on par with that of the Central Coast MPA's.

Having watched the last two meetings via webcast, it is clear to me Proposal 1/3 is incomplete. Nonetheless it encompasses about 22% of the coastline and is much more restrictive to the public as a whole.

The most restrictive, Proposal 4, manages to encompass about 27% of the coastline. This would effectively make the North Central Coast region a look, but do not touch, aquarium. It is so restrictive that fishing opportunities will be extremely limited and ventures to fishing may be dangerous as well.

Please remember the words of Commissioner Kellogg at the March 2, 2007 Fish and Game Commission meeting:

"... And before we get too carried away, we need to give them (MPA'S) an opportunity to work. And I believe that in this next phase we should pick an area, and this would be a good one, to make it as open to all the fishermen, the commercial, the recreational, the sport fishing, the kelp, abalone and everybody else as much as we possibly can so we have something to compare with the rest

of the MPA's we've already set up. And see if it makes a difference by allowing more fishing in some of the areas than others."

While I believe **Proposal 2-XA** is excessive, yet I strongly urge you to support **Proposal 2-XA**. Support of any other proposal will essentially put our ocean off limits to the public and relegate it as something to be viewed only on a video screen.

Respectfully,

Matthew S. Plut

From: Michael Anoba [mailto:michael.anoba@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 2:25 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Approval of 2-XA

I would like to recommend approval of 2-XA for the following:

Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines

Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups

Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.

Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.

Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Major differences between 2-XA and other proposals:

Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef – the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay.

Proposal 4 creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.

Proposal 2-XA has good solutions at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe situations

Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.

From: Michael R. Ebert [mailto:mike@machineryandequipment.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 10:03 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Salmon season

Please put me down as supporting plan 2-XA

Thank you.

Michael R. Ebert
San Francisco, CA

From: Shephard, Michael [mailto:mshephard@bofasecurities.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 10:33 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA all the way

This is the best plan hands down for the fish economy and the environment!!

From: michael starr [mailto:starr-michael@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 7:53 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA YES

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force and Fish and Game Commission Members,

I have written before about supporting proposal 2-XA but always about the safety aspects of access for the small boater. This time I ask you to consider the economic impact on the local communities, The Party Boat fleet is smaller than ever before, and now with the cost of fuel skyrocketing these guys are pressed to survive. The Party Boat owners have to be balanced in the MLPA process. The bait shops must be considered the tackle manufactures the sales people on and on. There is a historical significance, San Francisco's Fishermans Wharf, Berkeley Pier, Pacifica, Santa Cruz and Capitola Wharfs, all these areas depend on safe economical access to Fishing . Proposal 2-XA strikes a balance, it meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA. 2-XA creates a backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of

the MPA cluster. I feel that the other two proposals put forward are unreasonably burdensome and restrictive. Proposal 4 DESTROYS any hope of Pillar Point Harbor and the business in the area surviving. All Charter / Commercial business gone. Huck Finn Sport fishing since I was a 6 yr old could not survive. Ok all I can say is 2-XA !!

Thanks for reading my rant.

Michael Starr
Livermore, Ca.

From: michael starr [mailto:starr-michael@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 6:16 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support for 2-XA

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force and Department of Fish and Game,

I am writing to support prop 2-XA in the upcoming MLPA decision. The reasons are selfish, I love the ocean and ocean fishing. My fishing takes place on a 21 foot Reinell sportfishing boat. I often take several buddies or family with me. We launch out of two different places, Pillar Point harbor near Half Moon Bay or out the Golden Gate. Either of those two launches are best accessed under 2-XA. The other proposals have the fishing areas set much further from accessible ports. For example 1-3 & 4 both stack the fishing grounds further away...fishing zones are stacked on top of no fishing zones with the no take areas closest to the harbors. This extra distance is not only a fuel waste but a dangerous addition to the trip. The ocean can turn mean in a hurry, I lost two friends crabbing this last season alone. We need safe access to the resource, some areas cannot be transited making a dangerous trip an even more lengthy. Please pass proposal 2-XA. Than you.

Michael Starr
Livermore, Ca

From: Mike Giraudo [mailto:mike@intecsolutions.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 7:03 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA

I support 2-XA for the following reasons:

- Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA
- Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines
- Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support
- Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups
- Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster

- Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.
 - Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.
 - Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.
 - Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.
- Please support 2-XA

Mike Giraudo
Pacifica, Ca

From: norman mallory [mailto:mallory@mcn.org]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 9:48 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: proposal 2XA

We totally support proposal 2XA.

Norman & Roen Mallory
Fort Bragg, CA

From: pbdavidson7@comcast.net [<mailto:pbdavidson7@comcast.net>]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 10:40 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

To whom it may concern,

I have reviewed the MLPA proposals for the North Central Coast, and believe that only Proposal 2-XA provides a reasonable balance between conservation and socioeconomic impacts. This proposal meets the stated goals of the MLPA, is far more enforceable than other proposals, and has broad support from commercial and recreational fishermen and divers. Other more restrictive proposals will devastate coastal communities, ruin livelihoods, and drastically limit the opportunity for citizens to enjoy our state's resources.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Paul Venker [mailto:Paul@greengoinc.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 9:25 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA

I support 2-XA 100% Lets get this done.

Paul J. Venker

From: Peter Ratcliff [mailto:pratlif@mcn.org]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 11:06 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support 2XA

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force,

My name is Pete Ratcliff, and I have been watching this process from the sidelines since last year. I have attended numerous meetings and sent one previous comment (Feb. 2, 2008). I have stayed up late at night reading the guidelines of the "Master Plan". I still have conscious problems with the perceived achievement gained with the MPA "network approach" vs. sound management and critical placement of MPA's. By using the network approach it became necessary to create arbitrary MPA's to fill in the "GAPS" where in many cases there was no exacted conservation problem to begin with.

Another issue is cooperative enforcement. Many areas in these proposals create exclusionary zones adjacent to private and public/private property or areas that are stewarded by consumptive volunteers. From personal experience, I can tell you, that will definitely chill many former efforts to protect the resources and create a greater need for several more Wardens to fill in the "GAPS" of the volunteers.

I will pledge my support at this point for proposal 2XA as it has cross interest support....It does create reserves (NTMPA's), so it must have non-consumptive user support as well as consumptive user support.

Yours Truly,

Pete Ratcliff

From: Pierre [mailto:pierre.g@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 9:17 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA - Support for proposal 2-XA

I would like to state my support in favor of proposal 2-XA as the preferred proposal to send forward to the DFG.

I believe that, while it is important to help conserve the natural resources of the state of California, it is equally important to make these resources available for the enjoyment of responsible activities. Proposal 2-XA, in my opinion, best accomplishes this approach.

As a recreational fisherman, I contribute to the many millions of dollars of revenue the state collects in the form of fishing licenses and sales tax on fishing tackle/equipment and the support of related business (bait shops, fishing charters, guide services, and boating retailers). It is not in the best interest of the state or local communities to act in ways that would cause these businesses to close shop.

Proposal 2-XA is the best option to responsibly preserve the environment and the communities it supports.

Pierre Granier

From: JamesDeLaPena@aol.com [mailto:JamesDeLaPena@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 2:58 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Our Fishing Future

I want you to support 2-XA. We must not break the law. But do what we can to allow our grandchildren and us grandpas fish.

CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE 1 DECLARATION OF RIGHTS
Below is the language from the California State Constitution "Declaration of Rights"

Section 25. The people shall have the right to fish upon and from the public lands of the State and in the waters thereof, excepting upon lands set aside for fish hatcheries, and no land owned by the State shall ever be sold or transferred without reserving in the people the absolute right to fish thereupon; and no law shall ever be passed making it a crime for the people to enter upon the public lands within this State for the purpose of fishing in any water containing fish that have been planted therein by the State; provided, that the legislature may by statute, provide for the season when and the conditions under which the different species of fish may be taken.

It seems to me that a BAN on fishing is totally illegal.

I am registered voter and I vote.
Disabled veteran and I fish responsibly

Rev. Jim L. De La Pena

From: Richard Navarro [mailto:rnavarroelectric@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 8:29 AM
To: Melissa Miller-Henson; mike giraud; Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA s Proposal 2-XA

Hello, My name is Rich Navarro. I am a born and raised San Franciscan. I have been fishing since I was a little kid. My dad never took me out fishing however, my uncle took me out on the Lovely Martha out of Fisherman's Wharf in San Francisco in the early 70s. I was 11 years old. Anyway, I have been in love with fishing on the ocean since the first day on the water. I just hope that you pay attention to Proposal 2-XA for the simple fact that the fisherman that use this resource know more than anyone in this process these areas and have meticulously went through all the area's piece by piece and stayed within the guide lines and agenda mapped out by the MLPAs. So as a fisherman and a San Francisco Tyee club member who raises 50 thousand Salmon each year to be

released into the system each year I would like you to consider pushing Proposal 2-XA through as the most detailed and thought out proposal. Thank you for your time.

Rich Navarro

From: Elizabeth Ross [mailto:rfam@astound.net]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 12:24 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA 2-XA

I would like to show my support for MLPA proposal 2-XA. As a recreational fisherman and a California resident I believe this is the only fair proposal.
Rick Ross

From: rick stuart [mailto:rick@bigrick.fm]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 10:46 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA please!

I've been fishing in the Bay Area and Northern California waters for many years. As with most people who spend time in the outdoors I am way in favor of some protection of the natural habitat and sensible use. After looking at the various proposals it seems like the 2-XA plan makes the most sense for a mix of use and protection.

Rick Stuart
Oakland, CA

From: ronald whang [mailto:ronwhang@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 10:14 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA

As a certified SCUBA diver, a long life time resident of San Francisco, and dedicated environmental conservationist, I'd like to express my support for proposal 2-XA in the MPLA process. This proposal has clearly demonstrated that it meets all of the goals outlined in the MPLA.
Mahalo

ronald whang
sf ca

From: ronald whang [mailto:ronwhang@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 3:07 PM

To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA

I support 2-XA
please pass it
mahalo

From: Chirco, Ruth [mailto:Ruth.Chirco@diageo.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 11:52 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: MPA Blue Ribbon Task Force

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. The proposal will achieve conservation goals with minimal impact economically to recreational & commercial fisheries in California. It is the right thing to do.

Thank you for your kind consideration,

Ruth Chirco / Sonoma, California

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve Dillon [mailto:Dilbyrocks@rcn.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 11:43 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA support 2XA

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force members

My name is Steve Dillon from San Mateo Ca. I am writing you tonight to ask you to support Proposal 2-XA for the Marine Life Protection Act.

- 2-XA offers high levels of marine ecosystem protection, exceeding the scientific criteria of the MLPA goals and objectives as well as Department of Fish and Game Feasibility requirements.
- 2-XA is supported by a broad coalition of user groups including consumptive and non-consumptive parties
- 2-XA is the safest proposal available because it takes into consideration small vessels such as Kayakers and skiffs offering the balance of realistic alternative angling opportunities for the public as well as diving.
- 2-XA spreads out and diminishes the impact of social-economic burden that new conservation measures like the MLPA will have on their surrounding communities.

Our ocean resources are worth protecting, both for the marine habitat and our children's children. I believe striking the right balance of conservation of habitat and human interaction both consumptive and non-consumptive will yield a MLPA network for California that will be embraced in the end by all parties.

Please support Proposal 2-XA

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely
Steve Dillon
San Mateo, Ca

From: Steve Dunn [mailto:steve@solanosigns.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 10:13 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: Mike Chrisman
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

To the Blue Ribbon Task Force supporting Proposal 2-XA

I Care

I Fish

I Vote

I Support Proposal 2-XA for multitudes of reasons, among them:

Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA
Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines
Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support
Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups
Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster
Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.
Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.
Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.
Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

We appreciate and respect your efforts to make this a success!!

Steve Dunn
Fairfield, CA

From: STEVENPSI@aol.com [mailto:STEVENPSI@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 11:07 AM

To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA

I am a Coast Side Fishing Club member and I am in support of Proposal 2-XA. It appears to be the best solution for all.

Steve Phillips

From: ANNIEWEIKEL@comcast.net [mailto:ANNIEWEIKEL@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 8:24 PM
To: Melissa Miller-Henson
Subject: Support proposal 2-XA

Hello, first off let tell you about myself.

My name is Stephen Weikel, I have lived in California my whole life. I have served in the military, paid a lot of money in taxes, owned a home, have a wife and a daughter, work every day, and have seen the state of California go down the drain in the past decade. The reasons I can see and there are many, #1 the people of this state are ignored and their rights are overlooked. 2# Money is influencing the political landscape in an unfair manner and is causing a rift in our society. #3 Special interest groups have been able to wield an overly powerful sword, mostly to the detriment of California and it's inhabitants "animal and personal".

I am personally offended at how cheap my rights you guys are trying to sell are. These special interest groups are really getting a bang for their buck in a time when a buck isn't worth a whole lot. I am also personally getting very angry at the approach the state agencies take my freedoms and rights away from me in a so called "transparent process" this process is about as transparent as the oil still sitting at the bottom of the bay, another impact money has on fishing. The problems fish face have nothing to do with me or any other recreational fisherman. Gov. and bad luck plays the largest factor. On a good year my fishing and my visitors on my boat might take 300-400 legally caught fish of a variety of fish, one fish may lay 500,000 or more eggs, do the math yourself. It's not US!!!

The fact that a organization, charitable or otherwise can have such an influence on my personal freedom and countless others is unparralled. While some of the groups Packard, Monterey aquarium, ect. ideals may seem reasonable to some, to the rest of the citizens and the state of California there ideals will have adversely negative impacts. What might they be? I no I am no longer looking to by another house, and I may possibly move taking my income and tax revenues with me to a friendlier state. I know many others who plan to do the same. I will not start a business in this state now. I am already cutting my spending to save to move. Many businesses will be forced to shut down, many others will go bankrupt, and the state will lose billions in revenue created by fishing, boat sales, gas sales, camping, tackle, boating accessories, harbor fees, license fees. It seems to me on just the economic statistics alone we wouldn't be going down this road period. If these groups agreed to pick up the slack and pay the lost fees it

might seem like a fair trade to me, but from what I gathered, if they don't get their way they may pull out all together, which would be a victory for California.

Fish wise, the rockfish populations are coming back due to the limits put in place over the last ten years, I've caught more White Sea Bass, and Halibut recently than I had in the past. The Salmon issue is plainly a state problem cause by yet more greed. It seems the people who obviously make this state work, it's citizens, can never get a fair play. This process has broken more rules and have gone completely against the framework for this process. Once again, politics have played a role in something that was supposed to be non-political. Read the news, the state is in a recession, teachers are being lay-ed off, people are losing their homes, people are losing their jobs, and what do you guys want to do to make some elite minded, though obviously mentally unstable people happy, close down the ocean and really piss of tens of thousands of people to make a few feel good about themselves. That's really smart, but then again this state has a bad habit towards doing the wrong thing to please a few.

I want the ocean healthy just as much or more than any of these people, but I would do it a lot differently, and with a real purpose. This whole process is way overreaching and I find it very UN-AMERICAN. Hopefully whatever you guys do can be overturned in a real court of law, or maybe after this state has to file for bankscrupcy, we can get these rules impeached and maybe some of the government agencies and their people who perpetrated their crimes impeach or incarcerated. Well, I hope you guys use the brains God, Mother Earth, or whoever it is you look towards inspiration to, gave you and do the right thing. It's to late to call the whole thing off so vote for 2-XA, the least of the evils of this "plan"

Respectfully,
Steve Weikel,
Coastside Fishing Club Member,
California Citizen.

From: Taj Sharma [mailto:tajsharma@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 6:56 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Intiative Comments from a Family that Cherishes Fishing Together!

Please take a few minutes to read this and understand why fishing is important to a family in todays society and environment.

In 1983, growing up in the Fiji Islands, I had my best fishing trip ever. It was also my most memorable trip. At 40 years old, I still share pictures and memories of that trip with my 11 y/o son and 13 y/o daughter. Why? It was my last trip with my father. Shortly after that trip, my father passed away. I don't know what came over him but that month, he took us out fishing for an entire weekend. Yes we brought food home but more than that, we (my dad, brothers and sisters) brought home memories of a wonderful man who liked to fish with

his family.

I find with today's busy lifestyle, the influence of the Internet and electronics gadgets, there is no place like spending time with our young generation fishing and camping. Each time we go out, we make a weekend family getaway of it. My kids have made friends with other kids and stay in touch. This must have diverted some of the attention away from things like drugs and gangs that plague our society today. It's what we need: as parents, as children and as entire families.

I am not a good storyteller. This is not a story but a father's impassioned plea to please make PROPOSAL 2-XA the proposal that stays.

We are environmentalists as a family. We are stewards of our natural resources and coming from a country that has remained pristine as the day I was born, I know a thing or two about keeping it that way and leaving it for future generations.

Again, please select 2-XA as the option as it is the only proposal that is fair and balanced for all concerned.

Thank you for your time and appreciate the efforts being put forth for my kids and their kids.

Best Regards

Taj, Carmen, Nicole and Nathan Sharma
Discovery Bay, California

From: Tim Corfey [<mailto:tcorfey@alamedanet.net>]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 12:35 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: In Support of MLPA Proposal 2-XA

To all who are really concerned,

I live, play and work in the San Francisco Bay area. I raise two sons and we spend at least 3 to 4 days out of each week doing something related to the bay and ocean waters. After reading about, watching presentations on and watching the process for the MLPA proposals I have to present my choice for MLPA proposal 2-XA. This proposal is a well balanced and strong conservation minded proposal. Proposal 2-XA

achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA without going overboard. Proposal 2-XA also meets the Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines, it is enforceable and has broader public and ocean user support than the other proposals.

Essentially MLPA Proposal 2-XA utilizes a strong backbone of marine reserves and places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection while contributing to a network of MPAs in the recommended or preferred size range. The other proposals are not as balanced or thought out as well and in some locations are too restrictive with out having to be.

Proposal 2-XA has my support and its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community, the diving community and the fishing community. Please vote for MLPA Proposal 2-XA.

Thank you,

Tim Corfey
2937 Lincoln Ave
Alameda CA

From: SausalitoFishing@aol.com [mailto:SausalitoFishing@aol.com]

Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 12:16 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: No Subject

Dear Sirs

I am a fisherman in full support of proposal 2-XA.

2-XA meets the goals of the MLPA and also meets F&G feasibility studies.

I urge you to approve 2-XA.

Todd Magaline
San Rafael CA